

REMARKS

Status of this application

In the Office Action mailed on June 30, 2004, claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryant, U.S. Patent 6,286,046 (hereinafter "Bryant").

This response amends independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3-7 to more specifically point out and distinctly claim applicants' invention, cancels dependent claim 2 whose limitations have been incorporated into claim 1 as amended, cancels claims 10-18 to simplify the issues presented, and adds new apparatus claims 10-22 to complete the scope of applicants' protection.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The present invention is a method for capturing data in specified fields of HTTP request and response messages exchanged between a Web server and a Web browser. A gateway server positioned between the Web server and the Internet relays both incoming request messages and outgoing response messages, extracts data from specified data fields in the relayed messages, and posts the extracted field data into corresponding addressable data locations in a relational database. The invention thus populates relational database data locations defined by a database schema with corresponding field data extracted from the message traffic, allowing that extracted field data placed in the relational database to be readily manipulated by other users and other applications using conventional RDBMS data management techniques.

The cited Bryant patent discloses a different system that works in a different way to achieve a different result. Bryant uses a "trace monitor" 40 to copy the URLs in outbound request messages issued by a browser into a file, and also captures information from the response messages received from the Web server in the same request file that contains the URLs, or in some other file. The resulting trace file is then later used later to send the saved sequence of URLs requests to a server and to verify that the received responses from the server are correct (see Bryant, col. 5, lines 2-14).

Unlike applicants' invention as claimed, Bryant does not extract data from specified fields in the request and the response messages and post the extracted field data into corresponding addressable data locations specified by a schema in a relational database. Bryant merely saves the URLs and responses in a sequential file so that the session can be replayed later

by a submitter routine to simulate a prior interactive session previously recorded by the monitor (see Bryant, col. 4, lines 13-24).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to more clearly point out these novel features of applicants' invention, and newly added independent claim 19 also fully sets forth the extraction of specified field data which is mapped into corresponding data locations in the relational database.

In the outstanding Office Action, on page 2, the Examiner suggests that Bryant discloses the population of addressable storage locations defined by a database schema at column 5, lines 1-15. Reconsideration of this aspect of the prior rejection is requested. While the file of request URLs (which may also include information about the response messages) is arguably a "database," it is plainly not a "relational database" as claimed nor does Bryant disclose or suggest the performance of method step set forth in amended independent claim 1 for:

"extracting a first selected set of data contained in predetermined request data fields in each of said inbound request messages and storing said first set of data in corresponding addressable request data storage locations in said relational database, said request data storage locations being defined by a schema for said relational database"

Nor does Bryant suggest carrying out a comparable field data extraction and posting step with respect to outbound response messages as now set forth in claim 1.

Similarly, newly added independent apparatus claim 19 recites, inter alia:

"... means for extracting field data from said named fields of said HTTP request and response messages and posting said field data into corresponding storage locations designated to receive said field data extracted from said named fields, said corresponding storage locations being defined by a schema for said relational database"

Bryant does not disclose extracting data from named fields of both the request and response messages and transferring that field data into corresponding locations in a relational database. In fact, Bryant nowhere mentions a "database" per se and clearly does not suggest storing data from specified message fields in corresponding storage locations in a relational database. Applicants' invention makes it easy for database users to capture and manipulate message data on a field specific basis using a relational database, and Bryant plainly did not disclose or suggest such a scheme.

It is submitted that claims 1, 3-9, and 19-22 as now presented define inventive subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Bryant, and allowance of these claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles G. Call, Reg. 20,406

Dated: January 4, 2005

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this *Amendment* is being transmitted by facsimile to the central facsimile number of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, (703) 872-9306, on January 4, 2005.

Dated: January 4, 2005

Signature



Charles G. Call, Reg. No. 20,406

USPTO Customer No. 021253

68 Horse Pond Road

West Yarmouth, MA 02673

Ph. (508) 778-2630 Fax (508) 629-6540

call@patentsoft.com